



CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

WILMINGTON, DE

The Nemours Building
1007 North Orange St.
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, DE 19899
TEL: (302) 658 9141
FAX: (302) 658 5614
WEB: www.cblh.com

Collins J. Seitz, Jr.
TEL (302) 888-6278
FAX (302) 255-4278
EMAIL cseitz@cblh.com
REPLY TO Wilmington Office

May 30, 2008

BY E-FILING

Honorable Gregory M. Sleet
Chief Judge, United States District Court
District of Delaware
844 King Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

**Re: *In re: Rembrandt Technologies, LP Patent Litig.*
C.A. No. 1:07-md-1848 (GMS)**

Dear Chief Judge Sleet:

I write with regard to Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint, filed May 27, 2008, to address two matters raised therein that may be a source of confusion.

First, the modem manufacturers note that Rembrandt, in its opposition, cited to and relied on the draft amended complaint sent to plaintiffs when consent was sought for amendment. The modem manufacturers are correct that Rembrandt responded to the proposed amended complaint that was provided before the actual filing (which was not marked as a draft). Accordingly, Rembrandt's opposition addresses certain counts that the modem manufacturers chose not to include in their proposed amended complaint filed with the Court. Rembrandt regrets any confusion it may have caused the Court or other parties.

At the same time, the conduct alleged in the complaint filed with the Court is the same in substance as the conduct alleged in the draft complaint to which Rembrandt responded. And Rembrandt's opposition fully explains why the modem manufacturers' allegations fail to state a claim under Section 2 of the Sherman Act and Section 17200 of the California Business and Professions Code.

In any event, Rembrandt's error does not provide any basis for the modem manufacturers' request for leave to substitute a different proposed amended complaint for

Honorable Gregory M. Sleet


Page 2

May 30, 2008

the one submitted on April 11, 2008. The motion properly before the Court is for leave to file the proposed amended complaint filed on April 11, 2008, not any other.

Second, the modem manufacturers assert that Rembrandt's opposition exceeds the page limit allowed under Your Honor's new briefing page limit rule (posted on Your Honor's web page). Counsel for Rembrandt was unaware of the Court's web page posting until after it filed its brief, and is unsure whether the web page posting occurred prior to the April 11, 2008 commencement of briefing. Should the Court desire that Rembrandt file a brief not to exceed twenty pages, Rembrandt will do so promptly.

Respectfully,



Collins J. Seitz, Jr.
(Bar No. 2237)
cseitz@cblh.com

CJS,Jr./saj

cc: Clerk of the Court (by ECF)
Jack B. Blumenfeld (by ECF and hand delivery)
John W. Shaw (by ECF and hand delivery)
(614156)